

DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91125

THE CORRESPONDENCE OF ABELARD AND HELOISE

John F. Benton



HUMANITIES WORKING PAPER 124

© May 1987

ABSTRACT

This paper approaches the question of the authenticity and the authorship of the Historia calamitatum and the letters supposedly exchanged between Heloise and Abelard, through an investigation of word frequencies, phrases, and other stylistic issues, making use of computer-assisted counting and a concordance of the Historia and Letters Two to Seven.

Recently Tore Janson studied the cursus patterns used in the correspondence, and concluded that on the basis of that evidence, the correspondence had either one author or one editor who imprinted his or her style on all the letters. A study by the present author of the means and standard deviations of 24 words shows that on the basis of these words the letters attributed to Heloise cannot be differentiated from those attributed to Abelard; the style of the Historia calamitatum is close to that of the letters, but Letters Three, Five and Seven ("Abelard") are more similar to Letters Two, Four and Six ("Heloise") than they are to the Historia. The use of quotations is also consistent with the hypothesis that Abelard was the single author of the entire correspondence, and some of the concepts which appear in the letters attributed to Heloise are strikingly Abelardian. Moreover, Letters Two, Four and Six contain a number of phrases, more or less unusual, which appear in the letters attributed to Abelard and in other works surely written by him.

The author challenges the explanation that as Abelard's student and wife, Heloise wrote in the same style, and points out that according to the correspondence, contact between the two was minimal after their conversion to monastic life. The more contact one hypothesizes in order to explain the style of the letters attributed to Heloise, the more difficult it is to explain their content.

The paper was presented orally at the International Congress of the Monumenta Germaniae Historica on Fälschungen im Mittelalter on September 18, 1986 and is to be published substantially in the form which follows in the Proceedings of that Congress.

THE CORRESPONDENCE OF ABELARD AND HELOISE

by John F. Benton

Questions of authenticity and forgery are particularly susceptible to the influence of personal patterns of perception. Just as in an ambiguous drawing one observer may see a duck and another a rabbit, so in a given piece of writing one historian may see an authentic text (though possibly with minor interpolations or scribal or editorial revisions), while another declares the same work to be a fiction or a fraud (though possibly based on and preserving some authentic material).¹ Historians and other critics frequently try to settle such issues by imagining conditions of composition which seem plausible or even compelling, or by analyzing the presumed psychology of a supposed author. I have myself engaged in such arguments, and while they are often fun and sometimes useful heuristically, I can attest from experience that it rarely convinces others who bring different perceptions and presuppositions to the texts and who are also adept at making up plausible hypotheses and psychological explanations.

When the scholarly community reaches agreement that a given document is a forgery, that consensus is almost always based on technical arguments, frequently involving anachronism. Lorenzo Valla may have convinced himself that it would not have been in character for Constantine to give away his empire to the pope, but the arguments which were most convincing to posterity were those demonstrating the anachronism of a document which could not possibly have been written in the fourth century. Again, though its authenticity was seriously questioned, Yale's Vinland Map was accepted as a genuine product of the fifteenth century by a large group of knowledgeable experts until particle analysis showed that the ink contained a chemical not in use before 1920. And even then one committed specialist proclaimed, "I feel surprised

. . . but not shaken in the least; I accept the microchemical findings, but not the inference drawn from them."²

Judgments about the authenticity of the correspondence of Abelard and Heloise are affected not only by our personal orientation towards disputed documents and the canons of proof needed to establish either falsity or authenticity, but also by our personal feelings about Abelard and Heloise themselves. I have been told that Fr. Muckle, who raised many questions about Heloise's authorship, had a sister who was a nun, and that he could never quite believe that a respectable nun would write letters like those he had edited. Charlotte Charrier, on the other hand, cordially disapproved of Abelard and concluded that he composed the correspondence "par fatuité d'homme."³ Such personal reactions must be expected; we would be bloodless creatures indeed if we did not respond emotionally, one way or another, to such powerful personalities as those of Heloise and Abelard. And yet, how little has been securely established about these two people as compared to the amount that has been written about them. As much as we may try, we cannot come to this subject fresh, without preconceptions, without such images as those of Alexander Pope's Eloisa to Abelard affecting our understanding. Sentimental fantasies about the two lovers dominated the literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and Pope himself based his poem, not on the letters which we read and debate today, but on a translation which included completely fictitious letters and a fanciful reworking of the Historia calamitatum known as the Lettre à Philinthe. The later literary history of Abelard and Heloise is so full of sentimentality, misrepresentation and fraud that we must begin any research in the field by questioning the presuppositions inherited by our culture.⁴

The existence of differing world-views and personal reactions does not, in my opinion, mean that disputes about the authenticity of this correspondence will necessarily be a non-

terminating dialogue of the deaf. But if we are to avoid unnecessary misunderstanding, we must take particular care to comprehend the arguments of others and to treat them with respect. In addressing a topic like this one, emotional rhetoric, debaters' points and ad hominem arguments can easily obscure significant issues of logic and evidence. After reading most of the vast amount written about the issue of the authorship of this correspondence, I have become convinced that the capacity of imaginative scholars (including myself, of course) to find psychologically satisfying reasons for practically any hypothesized activity is limitless. If we are ever to settle the major issue of the authorship of these letters, it will not be through discussions of what might be plausible behavior for people of either the twelfth century or today, but on the basis of the most technical and indeed unemotional issues, questions of style, dating, sources and so on.

The organizers of the congress on "Fälschungen im Mittelalter" pleasantly told me that they had picked me to address this topic because they expected that I "could see both sides of the matter." In 1972 at Cluny I presented arguments in support of the hypothesis that the correspondence as we have it now was produced by a thirteenth-century forger who made use of a significant amount of twelfth-century material, including work genuinely written by Abelard.⁵ My hypothesis at this time was largely based on questions of possible anachronism and the historicity of certain details contained in the text, for example, the inclusion of meat in the diet authorized for the nuns in Letter Eight. In the following seven years I found nothing further to support my original hypothesis, which I came to consider defective in a number of ways and which had found favor with only a few members of the scholarly community, most notably Professor Hubert Silvestre, who has maintained and extended the hypothesis of a thirteenth-century forger.⁶ In 1979 at Trier I criticized my earlier hypothesis, and while I admitted

to considerable uncertainty, I accepted as likely the proposition that Abelard was indeed the author of the Historia Calamitatum and the other letters in the correspondence attributed to him. I also suggested, though I did not develop a detailed argument, that there are good reasons to think that Abelard also wrote the letters attributed to Heloise, that is, I reluctantly came back to the old position of Bernhard Schneidler that the correspondence is a literary "fiction" written by Abelard.⁷

The international congress on "Fälschungen im Mittelalter" has provided an occasion to consider this topic after another seven years. In my discussion this time, more emphasis has been given to stylistic matters, such as word frequency and choice. Let me reassure the reader from the beginning that I am not here arguing for some new, third position. Instead, the major goal of this paper is to present the evidence of a fresh, computer-assisted analysis of the text of the letters, evidence which accords with the conclusion that Abelard was the author of the Historia Calamitatum and all of the letters in the correspondence, including those supposedly written by Heloise.⁸ Since none of our manuscripts is earlier than the late thirteenth century, the possibility of thirteenth-century interpolation exists, but with the exception of a few disputed phrases or passages which have been considered possible evidence of anachronism, the text appears to be consistent with twelfth-century authorship and bears the mark of Abelard's style and thought.⁹ I should state clearly at the beginning that this analysis does not prove, in a positive way, that Abelard wrote the entire correspondence, but my results do show that on the basis of the words studied there is no statistically significant difference between the letters attributed to Abelard and those attributed to Heloise. I will present the evidence under five headings: the cursus, word-frequencies, quotations, concepts, and patterns of phrasing.

In 1979 Peter Dronke presented the first statistical

analysis of the cursus in the correspondence and distinguished the practice of Heloise from that of Abelard, though he concluded, "I do not know if Heloise's keen adherence to tardus cadences, exceptional as it is, is sufficiently distinct from Abelard's practice to differentiate her prose style decisively from his."¹⁰ Tore Janson has recently re-examined the question, analyzing a larger sample than Dronke did. He has concluded, in an as-yet unpublished paper,¹¹ that the evidence of the cursus patterns suggests that all the letters were written by one person, or at least edited by one person, though his approach does not permit him to say whether that person was Abelard or Heloise. The pattern of the cursus in the Historia Calamitatum parallels that in Abelard's other letters, while the style of Letters Two to Eight is closer to that of Abelard's sermons. In Janson's opinion, the cursus patterns used in the correspondence are distinctively those of the first half of the twelfth century, providing a very strong argument against the hypothesis of a thirteenth-century forger.

Let us turn now to a second body of evidence. My own stylistic analysis, based on a computer-assisted frequency count of vocabulary and a concordance of the entire correspondence, supports Janson's conclusion that there was a single author. To summarize a complex procedure and an even more complex set of data generated by this procedure, I can say briefly that for the words I have studied so far,¹² there is no case where the frequency in the letters attributed to Heloise differs from that in the letters of Abelard by as much as two standard deviations (that is, by an amount which would have statistical significance). The 24 words listed in the appendix in rates per thousand include the most frequent words and those which for one reason or another have been discussed in the literature. When one compares the letters of "Heloise" (Two, Four and Six) with Letters Three, Five and Seven, only one word (etiam) differs by as much as one standard deviation.¹³ That is to say, on the

basis of the frequencies I have analyzed so far, the style of the two sets of letters is virtually identical. There is, however, a small but perceptible difference between the frequencies in both sets of letters on the one hand and those found in the Historia Calamitatum on the other. When one compares Letters Three, Five and Seven with the Historia Calamitatum, five of the 24 words differ by as much as one standard deviation; no word differs by two standard deviations. Those words which are not within one standard deviation of each other are marked between the columns in the final table. The differences between the Historia calamitatum and Letters Three, Five and Seven are not large enough to indicate two different authors,¹⁴ but they do suggest that the Historia may have been written for a different audience, or at a different time, or as if it were in a different genre, or when the author was in a different mood. On this point too my evidence accords with that of Janson; there is something different about the Historia.

A study based on a comparison of means and standard deviations has the advantage of measuring variation within a text as well as the difference of frequency of usage between two or more texts. It is also a simple form of comparison, so that those who are relatively unsophisticated statistically can compare the numbers and make up their own minds as to whether two samples seem different or similar. It should be noted that there is an arbitrary element to my calculations, because the degree of differentiation would vary with the size of the base, for example, if I had made calculations on the basis of 500 or 2000 words. To objections raised on that point I can reply that my choice of 1000 words is arbitrary but not unreasonable; a sample of 500 words is so small that the results would be of reduced significance, and a sample of 2000 words would be too large for Letter Three and would obscure any measure of variation in Letters Two and Four.

I have been asked what results a chi-square test on these

figures would give. For comparisons of this sort, the appropriate chi-square test is essentially equivalent to a t-statistic test for differences of proportions.¹⁵ Since such tests obscure differences of frequency within a given sample, I do not consider them as useful as the mean and standard deviation figures given here, but I have calculated t-statistics for these numbers. The results show a greater difference between the Historia calamitatum and Letters Three, Five and Seven (the letters of "Abelard") than between those letters and Letters Two, Four and Six.¹⁶ Whatever the value of this test, it does not support the hypothesis that the letters of "Heloise" were written by a different person than the author of the letters of "Abelard."

A third approach to questions of authorship, the issue of the quotations used in the letters attributed to Heloise, has long been a subject of scholarly discussion, since there is both a general similarity and in some cases also a striking textual relationship between those quotations and passages cited by Abelard in other works. Except for Persius, all the authors cited in the letters of "Heloise" are favorites of Abelard, as shown by his use of their writings in other works. For example, Lucan is an author for whom he had a particular fondness,¹⁷ Cicero's De inventione he cited in Letter Eight, Sic et non, Theologia Christiana, and other works,¹⁸ and Seneca he called "ille maximus morum edificator et continentissime."¹⁹ Now that almost all of Abelard's works have appeared in modern critical editions, a full study of his use of quotations would be enlightening. Though the evidence of the quotations in the letters of "Heloise" has been subjected to various interpretations, they are entirely consistent with the hypothesis that Abelard was the author of the entire correspondence. But since these matters are familiar, I will not develop them further here.²⁰

Those who argue that the correspondence is an authentic exchange rather than a literary fiction which had not been given a final editorial polish, have difficulty -- or should have

difficulty -- explaining how Abelard, in Letter Seven, could address his wife as "O fratres et commonachi"²¹ or repeat in Letter Eight practically verbatim two passages supposedly written by Heloise in Letter Six.²² But such passages do accord with Abelard's known style of composition, to repeat himself and to include in one work quotations and passages which he had earlier developed elsewhere.²³

Other passages in the letters attributed to Heloise go beyond repetition to suggest a true unity of thought, providing a fourth type of evidence. One example, included in the appendix, is the expression of Abelard's doctrine of intention in the first letter attributed to Heloise: "Justice does not weigh what is done but the spirit in which it is done" (Nec quae fiunt sed quo animo fiunt aequitas pensat), an idea and indeed practically the very phrasing which also appears in Abelard's Theologia Christiana, his Commentary on Romans, his Ethics, and in the treatise Adtendite a falsis prophetis recently discovered by Louk Engels, as well as in Letter Eight.²⁴ A similar concept, also included in the appendix, is that of the moral indifference of those things common to both the elect and the damned, quae reprobis aequae ut electis communia sunt, as Letter Four puts it; this idea is also stated in much the same words in Letter Six and two times each in Abelard's Commentary on Romans and his Ethics.²⁵ A parallel of a different sort is the image in Letter Two comparing Le Paraclet to a newly planted vineyard in need of watering; this metaphor is very similar to one in Abelard's sermon De eleemosyna for the nuns of his new foundation.²⁶

Striking, aphoristic phrases might be evidence of either single authorship or the influence of one author on another. More commonplace "Abelardian" phrases are stronger evidence of Abelardian authorship, since they are not in themselves especially memorable. A concordance allows one to identify in the letters attributed to Heloise a number of turns of phrase which also appear in the letters of Abelard and others of his works.

Many of these phrases are the magisterial locutions of an experienced Biblical expositor and teacher, and while some can doubtless be found in other authors as well, others seem to me to be personal peculiarities of style. Abelard frequently rephrases a quotation after writing "Ac si aperte dicat" or some variant.²⁷ He regularly introduces a quotation with some form of "Quod diligenter attendens" or "Ut praedictus doctor meminit." The only times in his letters when he uses the adverb magnopere, it appears in negative phrases with the verb curare.²⁸ This same usage appears three times (once with pensare) in Letter Six. There is, of course, nothing unusual about "ut supra memini" or its equivalent, but I thought it worth recording that both "Heloise" and "Abelard" make use of both memini and meminimus. My choice of most of the examples given in the appendix is based on my impression that they are relatively unusual, but whether a given locution is a useful marker of Abelardian authorship depends, of course, on whether it appears in many works unquestionably written by Abelard and whether it is not a commonplace among medieval authors. The first question can best be determined with the help of a computerized text of Abelard's opera omnia, and may therefore be answered relatively soon.²⁹ The second question can be answered statistically with the help of other computerized texts,³⁰ or impressionistically by those with lexicographic memories. The examples in the appendix are offered in the hope of stimulating answers to both questions.

If the letters were written by different authors, how can one account for such similarity or identity in so many different forms? Similarities of phrasing and patterns of quotation have long been noted by such scholars as Schmeidler, Charrier and Muckle, and they have regularly been dismissed on the grounds that as a teacher and husband Abelard naturally influenced his wife's literary style. To affect not only Heloise's reading and choice of phrasing but even her use of the cursus, that influence must have been strong and continuing. The hypothesis of mutual

influence has recently been stated succinctly by Peter Dronke: "The most natural basic assumption is that they read certain texts together at one stage of their lives, and that, when they were separated, they still read texts in the same manuscripts, exchanging these (or sometimes perhaps making copies for each other) when necessary."³¹

If, however, we accept the chronology given in the Historia Calamitatum and the following correspondence, a chronology which is supported by other evidence, the opportunities for intellectual and literary contact between Abelard and Heloise in the period before the composition of the correspondence was slight. The two met about 1116, when Heloise was probably sixteen or so and already had a basic formation in Latin; as Abelard wrote in the Historia, "per habundanciam litterarum erat suprema."³² According to both Abelard and his critics, the tutor was initially more involved in seduction than education. When Heloise soon became pregnant, she took refuge separately in Brittany, and when she returned to Paris they lived apart, with Heloise eventually entering Argenteuil. Abelard's castration and their mutual conversion to monastic life probably occurred in or about 1118. There really was little time or occasion in those early years for Abelard to teach Heloise his personal style of cursus and his favorite constructions. Moreover, Abelard's style and reading matter changed significantly after his conversion, and the style of the letters attributed to Heloise is that which Abelard used in the mid-1130s, not that of the works he has left us from the period when he was in close contact with Heloise.³³

We really do not know how much contact the two had after their entry into monastic life and before the period in the second half of the 1130s when Abelard was deeply involved in writing for Le Paraclet, producing a set of writings which apparently began with the "correspondence." According to Roscelinus, in the period shortly after his conversion Abelard frequently visited Heloise while he was teaching away from Saint-

Denis. It is possible that he talked with her often, wrote her long and learned letters which have not survived, and sent her manuscripts of his own and other works. After 1129, when Heloise was installed at Le Paraclet, but before the time of the composition of the correspondence, Abelard may have had even more contact with her, both personally and through manuscripts, though both propriety and their monastic rule did not authorize a close relationship. Abelard himself says that he undertook to look after the sisters at Le Paraclet in person (corporali quoque presentia eis invigilare), apparently acting as the magister of the house.³⁴ But while the possibility of significant personal and intellectual contact existed, it must be said that it is a major function of the correspondence we are discussing to deny that any such contact took place. The first letter of "Heloise" states the matter categorically in asking "why . . . have you so neglected and scorned me that you neither hearten me with conversation when you are here nor console me with a letter when you are away?"³⁵ Paradoxically, if Heloise had enough intellectual contact with Abelard to be able to write in his style, using his pattern of cursus and his favorite quotations, she would not have needed to write a letter complaining of neglect, a letter which appears on this major point to be a fiction. Here is a serious problem for those who accept the authenticity of the letters, for the more contact one hypothesizes in order to explain the style of the letters attributed to Heloise, the more difficult it is to explain their content. Theoretically, of course, Heloise could have misrepresented her situation when writing authentic letters to Abelard, but it is hard to imagine a motive for doing so, whereas Abelard, as he makes clear in the Historia Calamitatum, was sensitive about the charge that his relationship with Heloise at Le Paraclet was improper.³⁶

If in writing these letters Abelard created a literary fiction to present ideas which he attributed to his wife, it would not have been the only time he appeared to do so. It has

long been known that five of the quotations supposedly used by Heloise to dissuade Abelard from marriage, as reported in the Historia Calamitatum, also appear in the Theologia Christiana, and it seems overwhelmingly likely that when Abelard wrote the Historia he felt quite free to create an imagined conversation. He also "reported" the words of Heloise, in both direct and indirect discourse, in his preface to the Hymnarius Paraclitensis, where he uses Heloise's criticism of existing hymns to justify his own composition.³⁷ We cannot know for certain, of course, whether or not Heloise wrote Abelard just those words which he attributes to her, but if she did, she wrote precisely what he needed her to say to counter a charge of presumption for writing his own liturgical compositions.³⁸

In this paper I have deliberately avoided a discussion of questions of motivation and psychology, of why Abelard might have undertaken to write a literary fiction, to what degree he might have been representing the actual words or thoughts of Heloise, and what reactions Heloise might have had to such a composition. That limitation keeps the emphasis of discussion where it should be in the present state of scholarly disagreement, not on speculation about the psychology of Heloise and Abelard, but on the more technical issue of whether the correspondence was written by one author or two.

Statistical evidence of the sort presented here cannot disprove the hypothesis of two separate authors, though the cumulation of such evidence makes the hypothesis less and less likely. It is my conclusion that the letters of "Heloise" and the letters of "Abelard" were written by a single person, and it seems to me reasonable to ask the champions of dual authorship to offer some relatively unsubjective means of distinguishing between the writing of one author and the other.³⁹ The large number of locutions and quotations common to both sets of letters and to other works surely written by Abelard makes me think that a single author was Abelard rather than Heloise or a third

person.

It is difficult to marshal one's forces on two fronts at once, and in this paper I have been more concerned to address the question of single rather than dual authorship than to deal with the issue of forgery rather than Abelardian authorship. Any hope for a convincing answer to that second question, it seems to me, will depend on whether a full analysis of the style of the Historia calamitatum and the following letters accords distinctively with that of other works written by Abelard. If further analysis does confirm the case for Abelardian authorship, we would then be faced with the challenging task of understanding, not the moral but the literary and psychological basis⁴⁰ for writing such a curiously contradictory work and how Abelard could have felt free to build a monument to his own reputation on a foundation of his beloved wife's intimate revelations.

California Institute of Technology

NOTES

1. On the philosophical problem of world-views and non-terminating disagreements, illustrated by an example comparable to the problem we face in evaluating the correspondence of Abelard and Heloise, see W. T. Jones, "Philosophical Disagreements and World Views," Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association, 43 (1971), 24-42. For his (and my) reference to rabbits and ducks, see Ludwig Wittgenstein, Philosophical Investigations, trans. G. E. M. Anscombe (Oxford, 1953), II.xi, 194^e; or cf. E. H. Gombrich, Art and Illusion: A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation, 2nd ed. (Princeton, 1961), p. 5.
2. For the initial favorable consensus see Proceedings of the Vinland Map Conference, ed. Wilcomb E. Washburn (Chicago, 1971). For the quotation see G. D. Painter in Helen Wallis et al., "The Strange Case of the Vinland Map," Geographical Journal 140 (1974), 194, with further comments cited in an editorial in Antiquity 48 (1974), 81. For recent literature see the article by Stephan Kuttner in the Proceedings of this congress.
3. Charlotte Charrier, Héloïse dans l'histoire et dans la légende (Paris, 1933), p. 24.
4. For the "modern" history of Heloise and Abelard, see Charrier, Héloïse, and D. W. Robertson, Jr., Abelard and Heloise (New York, 1972). The dupe who purchased the letter (in French) from Heloise to Abelard forged by Vrain Lucas is an extreme but not unique example of romantic credulity; Peter Ganz kindly pointed out the letter in Henri Bordier and Émile Mabille, Une fabrique de faux autographes ou récit de l'affaire Vrain Lucas (Paris, 1870), pp. 80-81.

5. "Fraud, Fiction and Borrowing in the Correspondence of Abelard and Heloise," Actes du Colloque International Pierre Abélard - Pierre le Vénérable (Paris, 1975), pp. 469-511.

6. For his most recent discussion of this problem, see his "L'idylle d'Abélard et Héloïse: la part du roman," Bulletin de la Classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques de l'Académie royale de Belgique, 5^e sér., t. 71 (1985), 157-200, now translated into German and published in this collection. To respond appropriately to this learned and challenging article, of which Prof. Silvestre very kindly sent me an advance copy of the proofs, would require a very different paper than the one I have written here, and I have decided not to attempt a partial commentary. The heart of our difference, as I see it, turns on the fact that I can no longer believe, as I did in 1972, that any medieval forger could write an extended work using so many of Abelard's favorite phrases and quotations, and most certainly that a thirteenth-century forger could avoid any clearly demonstrable anachronisms. Not that I believe the Hist. cal. accurately recounts "what actually happened," but that I consider all the errors and distortions can be attributed to Abelard himself.

7. Petrus Abaelardus (1079-1142): Person, Werk und Wirkung, ed. Rudolf Thomas (Trier, 1980) = Trierer Theologische Studien, t. 38, 41-52. Schmeidler also revised his opinion somewhat over the decades; for his final paper see "Der Briefwechsel zwischen Abälard und Heloise dennoch eine literarische Fiction Abälards," Revue bénédictine, 52 (1940), 85-95. Peter von Moos has provided an excellent survey of the literature of this controversy through 1972 in Mittelalterforschung und Ideologiekritik: Der Gelehrtenstreit um Héloïse (Munich, 1974).

8. I am embarrassed that this conclusion differs markedly from that of J. F. Benton and Fiorella Prosperetti Ercoli, "The Style of the Historia Calamitatum: A Preliminary Test of the Authenticity of the Correspondence Attributed to Abelard and Heloise," Viator 6 (1975), 59-86. For that study we estimated the number of words (minus quotations) in the Historia calamitatum, using a procedure explained on p. 78. That procedure gave us a total of approximately 6400 words, less than two-thirds the number now established by computer-assisted counting. All of the percentage-based conclusions about the Historia in that article are therefore erroneous. There are also, I regret to say, some small errors in the absolute word-counts. The figures in the present article have been verified from a concordance generated by the Oxford Concordance Program. It should be noted that the frequency counts cover only 1000-word units; the word saltem, for example, appears eight times in the whole of the Hist. cal., but two of those appearances are in the last few hundred words (out of a total of 10,391) and therefore are not counted in the statistics in this paper. In the earlier article, the word-count for facile includes facilius, but here the count is only of words read individually by the computer.

9. In 1972 ("Fraud, Fiction and Borrowing," pp. 495-6) I considered that the numbering of a chapter of the Bible, which was close (though without an exact fit) to the thirteenth-century system of Stephen Langton, provided strong support for my hypothesis of thirteenth-century composition or interpolation; Prof. Silvestre ("L'idylle, p. 178) now considers this issue "un des arguments les plus nets contre l'authenticité de l'Historia calamitatum." Since I introduced this argument, I feel a special obligation to show why I no longer consider it valid. In Abelard's day the citation of Biblical passages by book and chapter was uncommon; Abelard did it infrequently and only twice in the Hist. cal. In the first case (ed. Jacques Monfrin [Paris,

1978], line 618) he labeled as "Lib. Numeri, cap. LXXIIII" a verse which we now cite as Lev. 22: 24. A confusion between Leviticus and ad Levitas (that is, Numbers -- see Commentaria in epistolam Pauli ad Romanos, in Petri Abaelardi Opera Theologica, ed. Eligius M. Buytaert, CCCM 11 [Turnhout, 1969], pp. 88 and 137), was an easy one to make, and in the standard chapter numbering of Abelard's time, Leviticus, cap. LXXIIII would be our modern Lev. 22. The numbering of the verse is therefore that appropriate to a Bible of Abelard's day, as demonstrated by Abelard's usage in Comm. Rom., p. 234. This instance, in other words, supports the case for Abelard's authorship of the Hist. Cal. The second citation is much less clear-cut. In Hist. cal. (ed. Monfrin, lines 620-1) a verse we now call Deut. 23: 1 is labelled "Deuteronomii, cap. XXI." In the most common numbering system of Abelard's day, the same verse would be numbered "cap. CVII." "Cap. XXI" is so close to Stephen Langton's "cap. XXIII" and so far from "Cap. CVIII" that I felt confident that the reference had been written (with a slight error, of course) in the thirteenth century. What I did not realize in 1972 is that there was great inconsistency in the chapter numbers of pre-Langton Bibles, and no one system which he replaced. In Theologia Christiana, 2, 18, ed. Buytaert, CCCM 12 (Turnhout, 1969), p. 140, Abelard called the modern Deut. 4 "capitulum Deuteronomii XV" and modern Deut. 7 "capitulum XXIII." In Comm. Rom., p. 251, modern Deut. 30: 11-13 was "capitulum LVII" and Deut. 30: 14 was "capitulum LVIII." But in Sic et non, q. 138, c. 56, edd. Blanche Boyer and Richard McKeon (Chicago, 1976-77), p. 479, a verse which is now Deut. 16: 19 was labeled "cap. LXXXI." If modern Deut. 30 could be "cap. LVII" and modern Deut. 16 "cap. LXXXI," then Abelard or his copyists were quite capable of being imprecise or of using a variety of numbering systems. The reference to "cap. XXI" in Hist. cal. does not fit the usage of any identified manuscript or numbering system; it could be a distortion of Stephen Langton's system, but it could also have been derived from a Bible or

citation used by Abelard. In short, the citation of Deuteronomy proves nothing about dating, and the citation of Leviticus supports twelfth-century authorship, not thirteenth-century.

10. Peter Dronke, "Heloise's Problemata and Letters: Some Questions of Form and Content" in Petrus Abaelardus (1079-1142): Person, Werk und Wirkung, ed. Rudolf Thomas, Trierer Theologische Studien 38 (1980), 55. Though he presents his conclusions vigorously, stating that "from these tests results emerged that were more decisive and more startling than I could have surmised simply from an attentive reading of the letters," the figures which Dronke supplies do not support a differentiation between two authors.

11. I am extremely grateful to Professor Janson for sending me an advance copy of his paper, "Schools of Cursus in the Twelfth Century and the Letters of Heloise and Abelard," to appear in the Acta of the Congress on rhetoric and literature in the 12th and 13th centuries held in Trento in October, 1985, ed. Claudio Leonardi. In his statistical analysis, which Janson incorporated in his own study, Dronke used two different editions, that of Monfrin for Letters Two and Four and that of Muckle for a portion of Letter Six and the letters attributed to Abelard. The two editors differ significantly in their systems of punctuation (Muckle uses more periods, Monfrin more semi-colons). At my request Professor Janson very kindly recalculated the results using Muckle's edition throughout, and in a letter of 5 November 1986 wrote me that "in practice it does not matter which edition is chosen. The preferences are exactly the same in both samples. This is encouraging for me because it means that the method as such is not very sensitive to variations in editorial style."

12. In "The Style of the Historia Calamitatum," p. 74, I stated that to match the thoroughness of Frederick Mosteller and David Wallace's analysis of the Federalist papers, one might have to study over 100 words, but that with the assistance of a computer "such a survey is well within the range of possibility." The present study is limited to only 24 words, partly because many words in the sample were either context-sensitive or so uncommon as to be statistically uninteresting, but largely because even with the assistance of a computer, compiling accurate statistics by 1000-word units is still laborious. Robert L. Oakman, Computer Methods for Literary Research (2nd ed., Athens, Ga., 1984), pp. 139-171 is a very sensible and useful introduction to this relatively new field.

13. In this paper, as in the previous ones I have written on this subject, I have followed the numbering of the editio princeps, in which the Hist. cal. is treated as Letter One and the first letter of Heloise is Letter Two, rather than that used by Muckle in his edition in Mediaeval Studies. The procedure used here was to divide each letter into units of 1,000 words, ignoring any words left over at the end of a letter. Frequencies per thousand words were calculated for the Hist. cal., for Letters Two, Four and Six as a unit, and for Letters Three, Five and Seven as a third unit. I have omitted from these calculations the very long Letter Eight, which to all appearances follows the same style as Letter Seven. Standard deviations within each unit were also calculated. Two frequencies are considered to be within one standard deviation of each other if the difference between their means is less than the amount created by squaring the two standard deviations and then taking the square root of the sum. For example, in Letters Three, Five, and Seven the mean for obsecro is 0.7 and the standard deviation 1.1, while in Letters Two, Four, and Six the mean is 1.9 and the standard deviation 0.9. Since the difference between 1.9 and 0.7

(1.2) is less than 1.42 (the square root of the sum of 1.1 and .9 squared), obsecro is not a statistically significant word in these letters for distinguishing one author from another. Étienne Gilson, Héloïse et Abélard (3rd ed., Paris, 1964), p. 187, noted that Charrier (Héloïse, pp. 577-8) had counted thirteen cases of obsecro for Heloise and nine for Abelard and wittily asked, ". . . qu'est-ce que cela prouve? Que la tendance à l'obsécration est un peu plus forte chez une femme amoureuse que chez l'homme qui cherche à la calmer?" With that psychological argument in mind, it is worth stressing that statistically the two sets of letters cannot be distinguished by the frequency of use of obsecro.

14. A rule of thumb of statistical significance is that in measurements of two samples of the same population one can expect to find differences of two standard deviations five percent of the time.

15. See Thomas H. and Ronald J. Wonnacott, Introductory Statistics for Business and Economics, (2nd ed., New York, 1977), pp. 223-227 and 501-508. I am grateful to my colleagues Philip Hoffman, J. Morgan Kousser, and Leonard Searle for their advice on statistical questions.

16. In a comparison between Letters Two, Four and Six with Letters Three, Five and Seven, ad, etiam, non, quasi, saltem and ut have t-statistics of over 1.95. When comparing the letters of "Abelard" with the Hist. cal., a+ab, autem, cum, de, diligenter, est, etiam, facile, obsecro, penitus, quae, and vehementer are all above that level of significance. I should repeat here that in my opinion these differences are amply explained by variations of frequency of usage within the two samples (as the statistics for standard deviation show), and do not therefore provide

evidence that Abelard was not the author of the Hist. cal.

17. See Peter von Moos, "Lucan und Abelard," Hommage à André Boutemy, ed. Guy Cambier (Brussels, 1976), pp. 413-443.

18. See among other places "Abelard's Rule for Religious Women," ed. Terence P. McLaughlin, Mediaeval Studies 16 (1956), 242; Sic et non, prologue, edd. Boyer and McKeon, p. 89; Theol. Christ., 3, 133, ed. Buytaert, p. 245; and the references cited in these editions.

19. Dialogus inter Philosophum, Iudaeum et Christianum, ed Rudolf Thomas (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, 1970), p. 99.

20. In "A reconsideration," p. 50, I argued that an error in a long quotation from St. Augustine's De Bono Coniugali indicated that the Sic et non or another Abelardian fichier was the source of the quotation in Letter Six. In his excursus, "Did Abelard Write Heloise's Third Letter?" in Women Writers of the Middle Ages (Cambridge, Eng.. 1984), pp. 140-143, Peter Dronke counters that it indicates nothing of the source and that I have ignored "the two contexts of the Augustinian quotation." Prof. Silvestre has replied effectively and forcefully to this objection in "L'idylle," pp. 185-186. Prof. Dronke considers my reference to an Abelardian fichier as "a questionable and perhaps anachronistic assumption." I consider it obvious that Abelard, a peripatetic who spent much of his working life at places with very limited library resources (like Saint-Gildas and Le Paraclet), possessed a volume (or a number of volumes) of quotations which he had copied out for himself and then used in his writings; the various versions of Sic et non are examples or descendants of such volumes. I regret that Dronke has introduced into his discussion assumptions about the psychology and unstated beliefs not only of Heloise and Abelard but of myself (he

characterizes what he conjectures to be my underlying argument as "purest prejudice"); the danger of this approach, besides its irrelevance and unfortunate ad hominem quality, is that a critic may erroneously interpret a conclusion as a presupposition.

21. Ep. VII, ed Muckle, p. 269. It still seems to me likely that the existence of this phrase indicates the incorporation of some material from the lost Exhortatio ad fratres et commonachos; see "Fraud, Fiction and Borrowing," pp. 491-492.

22. Ep. VI, p. 245 = Ep. VIII, p. 269; Ep. VI, p. 247 = Ep. VIII, p. 270. Dronke, Women Writers, p. 143, deals with this problem by writing "one can only say that in the portions shared by Epp. VI and VIII there is a strong likelihood of contamination, and that some passages, which do not seem to fit into either argument, may well have been interpolated."

23. See Louk J. Engels, "Abélard écrivain," in Peter Abelard. Proceedings of the International Conference Louvain, May 10-12, 1971, ed. E. M. Buytaert (Louvain and The Hague, 1974), pp. 16-23, and Engels, "Attendite a falsis prophetis (Ms. Colmar 128, ff. 152v/153v). Un texte de Pierre Abélard contre les Cisterciens retrouvé?" in Corona Gratiarum: Miscellanea patristica, historica et liturgica Eligio Dekkers O.S.B. XII lustra completi oblata (Bruges and The Hague, 1975), 2, 213.

24. Ep. 2, p. 72; Theol. Christ., 5, 41 ed. Buytaert, p. 366; Comm. Rom., p. 65, lines 644-5, and p. 306, lines 324-5; Ethics, ed. David O. Luscombe, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford, 1971), p. 28, lines 9-10; "Attendite," ed. Engels, p. 226, ll. 19-20. Muckle discusses the passage in Mediaeval Studies 15 (1953), 55 and Engels in "Attendite," pp. 207-208.

25. Ep. 4, p. 82, lines 9-10 and ep. 6, p. 248, lines 28-29; Comm. Rom., p. 65, lines 629-30 and p. 304, lines 262-3; Ethics, ed. Luscombe, p. 2, lines 13-14 and p. 44, lines 30-31.

26. Ep. 2, p. 70: "novella plantatio cuius adhuc teneris maxime plantis frequens ut proficiant necessaria est irrigatio"; sermon 30 in Abelard's Opera, ed Victor Cousin (Paris, 1849-59, rpt. 1970), 1. 552: "Sed novella ejus adhuc et tenera plantatio vestris, ut crescat. colenda est eleemosynis."

27. In his sermons Abelard most commonly uses the phrase "ac si diceret," but in sermons V, XI, XXI, and XXII he introduces variety with the phrase "tanquam si diceret." Semon XI contains three examples of ac si and one of tanquam, the later following a quotation from St. Augustine (Sermon CLXXX) beginning "Tanquam diceretur." While awaiting the edition being prepared by Louk Engels, see Opera, ed. Cousin, 1, pp. 394, 432, 443, 451-452, 501-2. Possibly variations in style like this one will permit a relative dating of works like the sermons.

28. In this usage Abelard followed Augustine; see Theologia 'Summi Boni' 3.1.10, ed. Heinrich Ostlender (Münster i. W, 1939), p. 80, citing De Genesi ad litteram 4.4.9, ed. J. Zycha, CSEL 28/1 (Vienna, 1894), 101 or Migne PL 34, 300.

29. As I learned when I presented this paper orally, Prof. Udo Kindermann and his colleagues at the Institut für Alte Sprachen of the Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg have prepared such a computerized text, based on Cousin's edition.

30. The new volumes of the Corpus Christianorum, like the Chronicon of William of Tyre, ed. R. B. C. Huygens (CCCM, t. 73, Turnhout, 1986), with its microfiche instrumenta lexicologica, are an invaluable resource for comparisons of this sort.

31. Women Writers, p. 141.

32. Hist. cal., ed Monfrin, p. 71.

33. This statement is admittedly impressionistic and not based on a computer-assisted or statistical study. The style of the Hist. cal. and the letters in the correspondence (at least through Letter Seven) seems to me to be strikingly different from that of the Dialectica, ed. L. M. De Rijk (2nd ed., Assen, 1970), of which major portions appear to have been written before c. 1118 and in the period of Abelard's courtship of Heloise. The style of the letters is closer to that of Theologia 'Summi Boni', written about 1120 after Abelard became a monk of Saint-Denis, but there are still noticeable differences between that work and those of the 1130s. One I find intriguing is that the phrase verbi gratia does not appear in Hist. cal. or Letters Two through Seven, though Abelard used it often in Theologia 'Summi Boni'. One might object, of course, that the differences among these works are the product of the genre or subject matter rather than of a development of Abelard's style, but I consider this argument insufficient to explain all the differences, and in any case, if the adolescent Heloise learned to imitate the style of her mature teacher, she presumably was influenced by the style he was writing at the time.

34. Hist. cal. ed. Monfrin, lines 1479-80.

35. Ep. 2, ed. Muckle in Mediaeval Studies 15 (1953), 72: "cur . . . in tantam tibi negligentiam atque oblivionem venerim ut nec colloquio praesentis recreer nec absentis epistola consoler"; I have used active constructions in my translation, but in the Latin Heloise is the passive recipient of Abelard's neglect. Cf. ibid. p. 70: "nec . . . vel sermone praesentem vel epistola absentem consolari tentaveris."

36. Hist. cal., p. 101.

37. Peter Abelard's Hymnarius Paraclitensis, ed Joseph Szövérfy (Albany, N.Y. and Brookline, Mass., 1965), 2. 9-13. Szövérfy wrongly closes the quotation at the bottom of p. 9, but Abelard continues to "quote" or paraphrase up to p. 13, beginning to speak in his own voice again with "His vel consimilibus vestrarum persuasionibus rationum . . ."

38. It is also within the realm of possibility that Abelard composed the letter "from" Heloise which introduces the Problemata, but I can think of no way to establish with certainty who wrote it. Since the answers to the questions are his, it might be said that Abelard had the final say over what was written.

39. Dronke frankly states in "Heloise's Problemata," p. 55 that the characteristics which he considers indicate the "individuality" of Heloise's style "can occur at times, too, in Abelard's letters." Passages expressing deep emotion (and even, to use Gilson's phrase, obsecration) could as well be produced by Abelard writing a literary fiction as by Heloise writing authentic letters.

40. Whatever the history of its composition, this correspondence calls out for explanation. For scholars, however, issues of morality, of whether we end up considering Heloise and Abelard admirable people or not, seem to me to be questions of only minimal interest. What is important and challenging is not to judge these two people but to understand them.

COMPARATIVE PASSAGES

Ep. 6, p. 243.15	{{}}	Ac si aperte dicat: ...
246.23	{{}}	Ac si aperte diceret: ...
Ep. 5, p. 83.29	{{}}	Ac si aperte dicatur, ...
84.29-30	{{}}	Ac si apertius dicat: ...
85.25	{{}}	Ac si diceret: ...
93.44	{{}}	Ac si aperte diceret: ...
Ep. 7, p. 255.37	{{}}	Ac si diceret: ...
259.11	{{}}	Ac si aperte diceret: ...
266.37	{{}}	Ac si aperte dicat: ...
Ep. 8, p. 244.15	{{}}	ac si diceret ...
247.26-27	{{}}	Ac si aperte dicat: ...
268.36	{{}}	Ac si diceret: ...

* * *

Ep. 6, p. 245.7	Ex quibus quidem verbis aperte colligitur . . .
p. 250.30	Ex his liquide verbis colligitur . . .
Ep. 8, p. 269.4	Ex quibus videlicet Apostoli verbis manifeste colligitur . . .
Ep. 11, p. 251.72	Ex quo liquide colligitur . . .

* * *

Ep. 6, p. 248.26-27	Non enim magnopere sunt curanda quae . . .
p. 251.10	Non itaque magnopere ... pensandum est,
p. 251.33-34	non magnopere curanda esse docemur
Ep. 8, p. 276.19-21	nec etiam ... magnopere curarent.
Ep. 11, p. 253.100	Nec magnopere curandum est, . . .

* * *

Ep. 6, p. 242.28-29	Quod et beatus praecavens Hieronymus ... meminit dicens: {{}}
---------------------	---

Ep. 8, p. 254.23	Quod studiose praecavens Apostolus: {{}}
------------------	--

* * *

Ep. 6, p. 242.28-29	Quod et beatus praecavens Hieronymus ... meminit dicens: {{}}
p. 246.1-2	Unde et Macrobius Theodosius ... meminit his verbis:
p. 247.18-19	De quo et maximus ille sapientum in Proverbiis meminit dicens: {{}}

* * *

- Ep. 6, p. 244.44 . . . beatus non immemor Benedictus . . .
Ep. 6, p. 246.41 ipse quoque beatus non immemor Benedictus ...
Ep. 8, p. 271.39 Hinc et beatus non immemor Benedictus . . .

* * *

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|--------|
| Ep. 4, p. 80.33-34 | Quod beatus exponens Gregorius: {{{}} | inquit |
| Ep. 7, p. 264.1 | Quod quidem beatus exponens Hieronymus: {{{}} | |
| Ep. 8, p. 290.27-28 | Quod beatus exponens Gregorius ... ait: {{{}} | |
| Sermo 11, p. 443 | Quem quidem locum beatus exponens Augustinus ait: | |

* * *

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| Ep. 4, p. 80.39-40 | beatus diligenter attendens Ambrosius: {{{}} |
| Ep. 6. p.243.35-37 | Quod diligenter beatus papa Gregorius attendens ... ita distinxit: {{{}} |
| 246.28 | ... si diligentius attenderent, ... |
| Ep. 6, p.249.45-46 | Quod diligenter attendens beatus Augustinus ... |
| HC 202.5 | si diligentius apostolicam attendamus auctoritatem ... |
| HC 211.7-8 | Quae diligenter beatus attendens Hieronymus ... ait: {{{}} |
| Ep. 3, p.74.5 | Quod diligenter attendens Apostolus |
| Ep. 8, p.245.9-10 | Apostolus Jacobus diligenter attendens ait: {{{}} |
| 250.30-31 | insignis ecclesiae doctor Hieronymus diligenter attendens ... dicens: {{{}} |
| 261.41 | Ecclesiastes diligenter attendens ait: {{{}} |
| 264.27-28 | Quod diligenter beatus attendens Augustinus ... meminit: {{{}} |
| 270.5-7 | Quod maximus ille sapientum diligenter attendens ... dicens: {{{}} |
| 274.7-9 | Quod et diligenter beatus attendens Augustinus ... breviter expressit: {{{}} |
| 280.40-41 | Quod beatus diligenter attendens Gregorius ... : {{{}} |
| 284.9-10 | quod beatus Antonius admonet dicens: {{{}} |
| Rom. p. 191.159 | Quod quidem et Dominus ipse diligenter attendens |
| Ethics p. 6.18-19 | si diligentem attendamus |
| p. 58.30-31 | Quod diligenter beatus Stephanus attendens |
| Sermo 5, p. 394 | Quae duo diligenter idem apostolus attendens, |
| Sermo 13, p. 462 | Quod et beatus Apostolus diligenter attendens |

* * *

- Ep. 4, p. 81.43 Per Isaiam Dominus clamat: {{{}
 p. 82.1-2 Et per Ezechielem: {{{}
 p. 82.3-4 E contra autem per Salomonem dicitur: {{{}
- Ep. 5, p. 91.33 ipse etiam per Ieremiam fideles adhortatur,
 dicens: {{{}
- Ep. 5, p. 91.39-40 Et quod per Zachariam prophetam . . .
 praedictum est comple: {{{}
- Ep. 8, p. 245.1 Hinc autem per Salomonem dicitur: {{{}
 p. 270.32 Dominus per Joel dicit: {{{}
 p. 290.40 . . . per Eliphaz dicitur: {{{}
 Rom. p.55.284 Per Ieremiam Dominus dicit:{{{}}
- * * *
- Ep. 6, p. 248.5-6 Legerat ni fallor quod in Vitis Patrum scriptum
 est his verbis: {{{}}
- Ep. 8, p. 274.12 Legerat, ni[si] fallor, illud beati Athanasii ...:
 290.43 Legerat iste, ni[si] fallor, magni Christianorum
 philosophi Origenis homelias ...
- TC, p. 181.1658 Legerat, ni fallor, praedictus sanctus illud Suetonii
- * * *
- Ep. 6, p. 250.34-35 Unde et ipsos legimus apostolos ita rusticane ...
- HC 187.21-22 ... beato attestante Hieronymo, monachos legimus in
 veteri Testamento.
 206.28-29 Legimus et potentem illum reginae Candacis eunuchum
 ... praeesse
 208.24-25 ... quos frequenter legimus, vel etiam vidimus,
 monasteria quoque feminarum constituere ...
- Ep. 3, p. 74.6 Legimus Dominum Moysi dixisse: {{{}
- Ep. 7, p. 254.5 Legimus in Evangelio murmurantem Pharisaicum ...
 280.24 Legimus et Dominum ipsum ... exhibuisse ...
 281.7-8 Sicut de beata legimus Eugenia ...
 + 12 other instances of "legimus" in Ep. 7
- Ep. 8, p. 247.1-2 ... ut ait Hieronymus, monachos legimus in Veteri
 Testamento ...
 271.26 Unde in Vitis Patrum scriptum legimus: {{{}
 281.27-28 Legimus Dominum in Joanne, ut iam supra meminimus,
 vilitatem ... laudasse.
 + 6 other instances of "legimus" in Ep. 8
- Sermo 23, p. 505 beatus Hieronymus quodam loco meminit, dicens "Filii
 prophetarum, quos monachos legimus in Veteri
 Testamento, etc."
- * * *

- HC p. 194.27 ... ut praedictus doctor meminit, ...
 p. 207.9 et ut beatus meminit Augustinus in sermone quodam
 Ep. 5, p. 85.42 ut beatus etiam meminit Augustinus
 Ep. 7, p. 255.9 sicut et Hieronymus in psalmo XXVI meminit
 p. 256.2 ut Marcus meminit
 p. 274.11 ut enim Lucas meminit,
 Ep. 8, p. 242.13 ut in Rhetorica sua Tullius meminit
 p. 242.18 ut praedictus meminit doctor,
 p. 253.36 Ut enim beatus quoque meminit Benedictus:
 p. 254.20 et ipse alibi meminit dicens:
 p. 263.13-14 sicut in Vitis quoque Patrum quidam ipsorum meminit
 dicens:
 p. 263.17 Hinc Apostolus de diaconissa meminit dicens:
 p. 264.1-2 ut beatus quoque meminit Benedictus
 p. 264.11-13 beatus Gregorius ... meminit dicens: {{{
 p. 264.27-28 Quod diligenter beatus attendens Augustinus ... quodam
 loco meminit: {{{
 p. 279.10-12 Hic quippe magnus ecclesiae tam rector tam doctor ...
 ita meminit: {{{
 p. 280.1-3 quam et beatus Hieronymus ... ita quodam loco meminit:
 p. 289.32-34 Qui ... quodam loco sic meminit:

* * *

- Ep. 2, p. 71.7 in ea quam supra memini ad amicum epistola
 Ep. 6, p. 251.22 ut supra meminimus, Timotheo scribit ...

- HC p. 181.10 ut supra memini,
 p. 184.18 ut supra memini,
 p. 197.10 ut supra memini,
 Ep. 3, p. 76.13 sicut supra memini,
 Ep. 5, p. 91.28 ut iam supra memini
 p. 93.17 ut supra memini,
 Ep. 7, p. 265.25 ut iam supra meminimus.
 Ep. 8, p. 273.15 quod supra meminimus:
 p. 281.27 ut iam supra meminimus,
 p. 284.42-3 quod supra meminimus
 p. 287.21-2 ut supra meminimus:

* * *

- Ep. 2, p. 72.15-16 Nec quae fiunt sed quo animo fiunt aequitas pensat.
 Ep. 8, p. 265.34-5 Nec tam quod fiat, quam quod quomodo vel quo animo
 fiat, pensandum est.
 Rom. p. 65.644-5 ... non tam attendant quae fiunt quam quo animo fiant.
 p. 306.324-5 Deus namque, qui cordis inspector est, non tam quae
 fiunt quam quo animo fiunt attendit.
 Ethica, p. 28.9-10 Non enim quae fiunt, sed quo animo fiant pensat Deus,

* * *

- Ep. 4, p. 82.9-10 quae reprobis aequae ut electis communia sunt.
 Ep. 6, p. 248.28-29 Haec vero sunt omnia quae exterius geruntur, et aequae
 reprobis ut electis, aequae hypocritis ut
 religiosis communia sunt.
- Comm.Rom. p. 65 remuneratio tam electis, ut dictum est, quam reprobis
 Comm.Rom. p. 304 Quaecumque enim exterius bene fieri videntur ... aequae
 reprobis ut electis communia sunt et hypocritis
 sicut veris fidelibus.
- Ethics p. 2 Quae quidem omnia cum eque reprobis ut bonis eveniant
 p. 44.30 Opera quippe quae, ut prediximus, eque reprobis ut
 electis communia sunt, omnia in se indifferentia
 sunt,

* * *

- Ep. 6, p. 248.21-22 in his quae media boni et mali atque
 indifferentia dicuntur,
 Ep. 6, p. 251.33 ea, quae fiunt exterius, et indifferentia
 vocantur,
 Ep. 8, p. 278.28-29 intermedia boni et mali, hoc est
 indifferentia computantur,

* * *

- Ep. 4, p. 81.21-22 qui cordis et renum probator est, et in abscondito
 videt.
 Ep. 6, p. 251.11 qui cordis et renum probator est, et in abscondito
 videt, . . .
 Rom. p. 78.61-62 Unde et ipse probator cordis et renum in abscondito
 videre dicitur.
 Sermo 14, p. 468 In abscondito magis quam in manifesto Deus videre
 dicitur, quia probator cordis et renum, non tam
 quae fiunt, quam quo animo fiant attendit, nec
 tam opera quam intentionem remunerat.

[This phrase may be a quotation and has Biblical overtones; cf. Jerem.
 11: 20 and 20: 12.]

* * *

- Ep. 6, p. 243.26-27 Sed et cum omnium virtutum discretio sit mater, et
 omnium bonorum moderatrix sit ratio, . . .
- Ep. 8, p. 274.28 omnium virtutum mater discretio
 Ser. 30, p. 551 Est enim discretio mater omnium virtutum.
 [Cf. Cassian, *Collationes* 2, 4 (PL 49, 528): omnium namque virtutum
 generatrix, custos moderatrixque discretio est.]

* * *

Ep. 4, p. 82 Non coronabitur nisi qui legitime certaverit. Non
quaero coronam victoriae.

Sermo 26, p. 521-2 Non coronabitur nisi qui legitime certaverit, ab
omnibus se abstinere, ne coronam scilicet victoriae
perdat.

[See Vulgate 2. Tim. 2: 5: Nam et qui certat in agone, non coronatur nisi
legitime certaverit.]

WORD COUNT OF CORRESPONDENCE

Ep. 1 = HC	text:	10,391 (89%)	
	quotations:	1,265 (11%)	11,656 (19%)
Ep. 2	text:	2,125 (96%)	
	quotations:	96 (04%)	2,221 (04%)
Ep. 3	text:	1,526 (93%)	
	quotations:	182 (07%)	1,708 (03%)
Ep. 4	text:	2,099 (89%)	
	quotations:	260 (11%)	2,359 (04%)
Ep. 5	text:	4,541 (90%)	
	quotations:	520 (10%)	5,061 (08%)
Ep. 6	text:	3,425 (67%)	
	quotations:	1,672 (33%)	5,097 (08%)
Ep. 7	text:	8,197 (71%)	
	quotations:	3,303 (29%)	11,500 (18%)
Ep. 8	text:	15,716 (70%)	
	quotations:	6,887 (30%)	22,603 (36%)
	total text:	48,020 (77%)	
	total quotations:	14,185 (23%)	
	grand total:		62,205

HISTORIA CALAMITATUM

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	m	s.d.
a + ab	15	3	6	5	11	3	3	3	5	10	6.4	4.2
ad	17	13	6	14	15	21	23	12	17	13	15.1	4.8
amplius	5	7	5	0	2	0	1	1	0	5	2.6	2.6
autem	8	4	7	8	10	8	13	5	6	6	7.5	2.6
cum	10	9	7	5	8	14	18	12	15	11	10.9	4.0
de	12	7	9	7	4	6	3	7	7	10	7.2	2.7
diligenter	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	0.6
est	10	8	6	7	3	8	8	6	4	6	6.6	2.1
et	30	27	46	26	36	39	33	38	36	33	34.4	6.0
etiam	2	0	6	4	3	0	0	3	2	9	2.9	2.9
facile	1	1	4	1	0	0	2	0	3	0	1.2	1.4
in	21	30	24	16	21	18	16	25	30	24	22.5	5.1
non	7	12	12	10	3	12	3	12	6	4	8.1	3.9
obsecro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0
penitus	2	2	2	1	3	2	3	1	1	2	1.9	0.7
quae	1	6	5	7	4	1	3	4	6	2	3.9	2.1
quam	1	5	14	16	15	5	3	13	13	13	9.8	5.6
quasi	4	2	1	0	2	5	5	3	5	2	2.9	1.8
quod	5	5	9	9	13	15	12	10	6	5	8.9	3.6
saltem	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	1	1	0.6	1.0
si	0	4	7	5	1	8	2	5	4	5	4.1	2.5
tanto	6	2	1	1	2	1	0	1	3	4	2.1	1.8
ut	19	9	9	8	9	12	10	5	17	12	11.0	4.2
vehementer	1	2	6	4	3	1	3	1	1	1	2.3	1.7

EPISTLES 2, 4 AND 6

"HELOISE"

	2-A	2-B	4-A	4-B	6-A	6-B	6-C	m	s.d.
a + ab	3	5	3	10	15	7	11	7.7	4.5
ad	12	8	8	7	12	6	10	9.0	2.4
amplius	1	2	2	3	1	0	0	1.3	1.1
autem	4	5	4	6	3	2	0	3.4	2.0
cum	4	7	9	5	6	6	11	6.9	2.4
de	9	4	5	5	14	9	15	8.7	4.4
diligenter	1	0	0	1	3	0	1	0.9	1.1
est	7	11	8	16	10	9	18	11.3	4.2
et	36	22	31	34	31	42	52	35.4	9.5
etiam	2	2	1	6	5	5	8	4.1	2.5
facile	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0.6	0.8
in	20	22	31	29	18	21	17	22.6	5.4
non	11	28	8	18	16	13	11	15.0	6.6
obsecro	2	3	3	2	1	1	1	1.9	0.9
penitus	0	1	1	2	1	1	0	0.9	0.7
quae	6	10	8	8	7	7	13	8.4	2.4
quam	9	25	11	11	11	9	8	12.0	5.9
quasi	2	2	0	0	0	4	2	1.4	1.5
quod	8	9	14	11	13	13	3	10.1	3.8
saltem	4	1	1	3	1	0	0	1.4	1.5
si	4	11	3	7	8	8	2	6.1	3.2
tanto	4	1	7	2	1	0	2	2.4	2.4
ut	12	11	22	10	17	15	13	14.3	4.2
vehementer	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0.4	0.5

EPISTLES 3 AND 5

	3	5-A	5-B	5-C	5-D	m	s.d
a + ab	6	5	12	12	7	8.4	3.4
ad	14	10	10	13	15	12.4	2.3
amplius	0	3	7	2	0	2.4	2.9
autem	7	4	3	0	1	3.0	2.7
cum	4	10	10	10	9	8.6	2.6
de	10	8	10	3	8	7.8	2.9
diligenter	3	3	0	0	0	1.2	1.6
est	12	16	23	6	21	15.6	6.9
et	48	24	33	49	38	38.4	10.5
etiam	4	5	9	10	8	7.2	2.6
facile	1	1	0	0	1	0.6	0.5
in	15	37	23	26	20	24.2	8.2
non	9	6	12	12	21	12.0	5.6
obsecro	1	0	3	0	3	1.4	1.5
penitus	0	0	2	2	1	1.0	1.0
quae	5	10	9	6	8	7.6	2.1
quam	5	11	17	16	8	11.4	5.1
quasi	3	3	0	2	3	2.2	1.3
quod	20	4	15	11	7	11.4	6.3
saltem	0	0	2	1	0	0.6	0.9
si	9	4	8	6	6	6.6	1.9
tanto	2	2	10	3	0	3.4	3.8
ut	8	11	11	13	8	10.2	2.2
vchementer	0	2	0	1	0	0.6	0.9

EPISTLE 7

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	m	s.d.
a + ab	18	13	9	2	8	11	8	9	9.8	4.6
ad	5	7	15	15	14	14	17	8	11.9	4.5
amplius	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	8	2.0	2.8
autem	3	4	2	0	3	2	3	4	2.6	1.3
cum	8	14	9	9	5	6	3	4	7.3	3.5
de	10	18	16	17	7	18	7	8	12.6	5.1
diligenter	1	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	1.3	1.6
est	10	11	14	7	17	10	8	9	10.8	3.3
et	29	46	36	47	34	35	40	29	37.0	6.9
etiam	6	11	16	12	10	7	16	8	10.8	3.8
facile	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0.3	0.5
in	32	23	30	18	26	26	29	20	25.5	4.9
non	7	7	11	8	10	7	6	19	9.4	4.2
obsecro	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.3	0.5
penitus	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.3	0.5
quae	10	7	7	11	3	10	6	10	8.0	2.7
quam	12	8	13	16	9	10	7	10	10.6	2.9
quasi	1	4	5	2	2	6	3	2	3.1	1.7
quod	6	10	8	8	6	2	6	11	7.1	2.8
saltem	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.1	0.4
si	2	2	3	5	6	2	3	6	3.6	1.8
tanto	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	6	1.9	2.0
ut	8	8	10	9	7	8	17	13	10.0	3.4
vehementer	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0.3	0.5

	HC			3 + 5 + 7			2 + 4 + 6	
	m	s.d.	dif.	m	s.d.	dif.	m	s.d.
a + ab	6.4	4.2		9.2	4.1		7.7	4.5
ad	15.1	4.8		12.1	3.7		9.0	2.4
amplius	2.6	2.6		2.2	2.7		1.3	1.1
autem	7.5	2.6	1	2.8	1.9		3.4	2.0
cum	10.9	4.0		7.8	3.2		6.9	2.4
de	7.2	2.7		10.7	4.9		8.7	4.4
diligenter	0.2	0.6		1.2	1.5		0.9	1.1
est	6.6	2.1	1	12.6	5.3		11.3	4.2
et	34.4	6.0		37.5	8.1		35.4	9.5
etiam	2.9	2.9	1	9.4	3.7	1	4.1	2.5
facile	1.2	1.4		0.4	0.5		0.6	0.8
in	22.5	5.1		25.0	6.0		22.6	5.4
non	8.1	3.9		10.4	4.8		15.0	6.6
obsecro	0.0	0.0		0.7	1.1		1.9	0.9
penitus	1.9	0.7	1	0.5	0.8		0.9	0.7
quae	3.9	2.1	1	7.8	2.4		8.4	2.4
quam	9.8	5.6		10.9	3.7		12.0	5.9
quasi	2.9	1.8		2.8	1.6		1.4	1.5
quod	8.9	3.6		8.8	4.8		10.1	3.8
saltem	0.6	1.0		0.3	0.6		1.4	1.5
si	4.1	2.5		4.8	2.3		6.1	3.2
tanto	2.1	1.8		2.5	2.8		2.4	2.4
ut	11.0	4.2		10.1	2.9		14.3	4.2
vehementer	2.3	1.7		0.4	0.7		0.4	0.5